

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : David Arsenault Art Unit : 2143
Serial No. : 09/693,840 Examiner : T. Mauro
Filed : October 23, 2000
Title : PROCESSING SELECTED BROWSER REQUESTS

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF ON APPEAL

(1) Real Party in Interest

AOL LLC, formerly known as America Online, Inc., is the real party in interest.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

There are no related appeals and interferences.

(3) Status of Claims

Rejected Claims

7-11, 18-22, and 29-72.

Cancelled Claims

12-17, and 23-28.

ClaimsAppealed

7-11, 18-22, and 29-72.

(4) Status of Amendments

At the time of this brief's filing, the reply filed October 1, 2004 and supplemental reply filed December 22, 2004 have not been entered. According to Examiner Mauro, the supplemental reply filed December 22, 2004 will be entered, but will not be considered to place the application in condition for allowance.

Applicant's representative, Kevin Greene, conducted telephone discussions with Examiner Mauro and Examiner Wiley on December 21, 2004 and December 22, 2004. Applicant's representative contacted the Examiners to inquire as to the status of the reply filed

on October 1, 2004 in response to the Office Action dated May 28, 2004. As of December 22, 2004, Applicant had not received any response from the Patent Office regarding this reply.

Given the pending deadline of December 28, 2004 to file the appeal brief, and out of concern to prevent additional extension of time fees, Applicant's representative contacted the Examiners to determine the status of this case. Examiner Mauro indicated that the reply had not yet been placed on his docket and that he therefore could not issue an action. Nevertheless, attempting to advance prosecution, Examiner Wiley indicated that he would have Examiner Mauro review the reply and contact Applicant's representative about what action he would take once this item was placed on his docket.

Examiner Mauro contacted Applicant's representative on December 22, 2004 once he had reviewed the October 1 reply. Examiner Mauro indicated that the October 1, 2004 reply would be considered non-compliant because the listing of claims inaccurately stated the status of claims 40, 41, 42, 49, 50, and 51. Specifically, the October 1 reply identified those claims as currently amended, when they were in fact previously presented. Applicant pointed out that the claims had been provided merely out of courtesy, and that no claim listing or status indication was required of Applicant in the absence of an amendment. But Examiner Mauro maintained his position and indicated that this perceived formality would need to be corrected with a supplemental reply to gain substantive consideration.

A supplemental reply was filed on December 22, 2004 with accurate status indications being accorded to each claim. The December 22 Reply has not been entered at this time. However, Applicant notes that the December 22 Reply recites the arguments set forth previously in the October 1 reply, and that Examiner Mauro indicated (during the December 22 telephone conference) that he believed these arguments would not place the application into condition for allowance.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The subject matter of independent claims 7, 18, 29, 34, 43, and 52 may be employed, for example, to display a toolbar in conjunction with some webpages, but not others. According to an example from the application, a user may request a webpage by entering the uniform resource locator (URL) for the webpage into a browser. Application, Page 7, Lines 17-18. The URL

includes the domain name of the destination server on which the webpage is stored. Application, Page 7, Lines 18-19. The browser sends a request including the URL to a proxy server 120, which compares the requested URL to a list of selected URLs. Application, Page 7, Lines 25-29. When the requested URL does not match a selected URL, the request is forwarded to the destination server and processed according to conventional mechanisms. Application, Page 8, Lines 3-5.

On the other hand, when the requested URL matches one of the selected URLs, the request is forwarded to a jump server (which is not the destination server storing the webpage). Application, Page 8, Lines 8-10. The jump server then processes the request by retrieving the webpage from the destination server, splitting the display of the web browser into at least two sections, displaying the retrieved webpage in one of the sections, and displaying a toolbar in the second of the sections. Application, Page 9, Lines 5-11.

More generally, independent claims 7, 18, and 29 are directed, respectively, to a method and systems for processing a browser request from a browser executing on a computer. The browser request is intercepted. Application, Page 7, Lines 25-29. When the browser request specifies a selected destination network resource, a display of the browser is split into at least two sections. Application, Page 8, Lines 8-10; Page 9, Lines 5-11. The selected destination network resource is displayed in a first of the two sections, and a toolbar is displayed in a second of the two sections. Application, Page 9, Lines 5-11.

Claims 34, 43, and 52 are directed, respectively, to a method and systems for processing a browser request from a browser executing on a computer. The browser request specifies a destination network resource residing on a destination server. Application, Page 7, Lines 17-19. The browser request is intercepted and a determination is made as to whether the destination network resource specified by the browser request matches at least one selected destination network resource. Application, Page 7, Lines 25-29. When the destination network resource specified by the browser request does match at least one selected destination network resource, the browser request is directed to a server other than the destination server for processing. Application, Page 8, Lines 8-10. The processing includes retrieving the destination network resource specified by the browser request, splitting a display of the browser at the computer into at least two sections, displaying the destination network resource specified by the browser

request in a first of the two sections, and displaying a toolbar in a second of the two sections.
Application, Page 9, Lines 5-11.

(6) Grounds of Rejection

Claims 7, 8, 11, 18, 19, 22, 29, 30, 33, and 61-72 are rejected as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,490,602 (Kraemer).

Claims 9, 10, 20, 21, 31, 32, and 34-60 are rejected as obvious over Kraemer in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,565,243 (Yedidia).

(7) Argument

Rejections under 35 USC 102

1. Kraemer fails to disclose all of the claim limitations of independent claims 7, 18, and 29.

The record does not establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation with respect to independent claims 7, 18, and 29. To establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation, a single reference must disclose all of the claim elements. MPEP 2131. Notably, Kraemer fails to describe or suggest using a requested destination resource as the basis for providing toolbar functionality and, consequently, does not provide for all of the features of independent claims 7, 18, and 29.

Kraemer describes a system in which a client device 120 connects to an enhanced functionality server 100. The user can then use a browser to request webpages on websites 130, with the requests first being sent to the enhance functionality server 100. The enhanced functionality server 100 retrieves the requested webpage and adds a toolbar to the webpage, which is then delivered to the browser.

However, Kraemer does not disclose that the toolbar is added to the webpage *when the browser request specifies a selected destination network resource*. Simply, Kraemer is silent with regards to applying conditions on when the toolbar is added. With regards to this feature, the Office Action points to sections of Kraemer that indicate websites 130 can be associated with vendors, but these sections do not describe providing a toolbar when the request specifies a webpage that is associated with a vendor. See Office Action, Page 3, Lines 3-5. Rather, these

sections merely indicate that the websites may be websites associated with a vendor. Kraemer, Col. 2, Lines 48-50 and Lines 53-58; Col. 3, Lines 21-32. Further, as acknowledged in the Office Action, Kraemer does not describe “determining whether the destination resource [in the request] matches a selected destination resource” or “comparing the destination network resource specified to a list of selected destination resources to determine if a match exists.” Office Action, Page 9, Lines 7-8 & Page 7, Lines 2-3. Nor does Kraemer describe any other techniques that may be used to condition displaying the toolbar on the request specifying a selected destination resource. Consequently, Kraemer does not and can not disclose that the toolbar is displayed when the browser request specifies a selected destination resource.

Moreover, Kraemer suggests that the toolbar is always added to webpages once a user connects to the enhanced functionality server 100. Kraemer seeks to make the toolbar available for “*any* product or vendor” webpage the user may visit. Kraemer, Col. 3, Lines 28-29 (emphasis added). Practically, in order to do so, the toolbar would need to be provided for all webpages accessed by the user after connecting to the enhance functionality server. Thus, Kraemer does not even generally describe having conditions for when the toolbar is added to the webpage.

Accordingly, Kraemer does not disclose all of the limitations of independent claims 7, 18, and 29 and, consequently, does not anticipate independent claims 7, 18, and 29, or the claims that depend from them. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant requests that the rejections of these claims be reversed.

Rejections Under 35 USC 103

1. Kraemer and Yedidia fail to disclose all of the claim limitations of independent claims 34, 43, and 52.

Independent claims 34, 43, and 52 are not obvious in view of Kraemer and Yedidia, either singly or in combination, because those references, even if combined, do not provide for all of the elements of claims 34, 43, and 52. “To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, [the combined references] must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.” MPEP 2143.

The Office Action acknowledges that Kraemer does not disclose at least determining whether the destination resource specified by a browser request matches a selected destination

resource and directing the browser request to a server other than the destination server when the destination resource specified by the browser request matches a selected destination resource. Office Action, Page 9, Lines 7-9.

To provide for these deficiencies of Kraemer, the Office Action cites Yedidia, asserting that Yedidia discloses “comparing the browser request for the specified resource to a list of pre-selected resources to determine if external content should be added” and “directing the browser request to a server other than a destination server on which the selected destination server resides.” Office Action, Page 9, Lines 10-19. To support that Yedidia discloses directing the browser request to a server other than the destination server, the Office Action asserts that Yedidia discloses directing the request to a proxy server. *Id.*

Even if Yedidia does show these items, the rejection ignores the fact that the claims recite a process involving directing the browser request to a server other than the destination server *when the destination network resource specified by the browser request matches at least one selected destination network resource*. “All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of [the] claim against the prior art.” MPEP 2143.03 (citing *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970)).

Yedidia describes a content injector 40 that receives requests for content. The content injector 40 applies an addition policy to the request to determine if additional content should be added to the content requested. Yedidia, Col. 4, Lines 30-32. This policy involves reviewing the request for protocol information or the type of content being requested to determine whether content should be added. Yedidia, Col. 7, Lines 19-42. If it is determined that content should be added, the content injector 40 sends a response to the request so as to initiate a session with the browser. Yedidia, Col. 8, Lines 21-65. At the same time, content injector 40 initiates a session with the destination server that has the resource identified in the request and retrieves the resource. *Id.* The content injector 40 then sends the additional content and the resource to the browser. *Id.*

From this, it is clear that Yedidia does not direct the request to a server other than the destination server *when the resource specified by the request matches a selected resource*. To the contrary, it is clear that the content injector 40 is responsible for *both* the evaluating of the

addition policy and the processing when additional content is to be added. Therefore, the request is not directed to another server for processing when additional content is to be added.

Kraemer and Yedidia accordingly fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for independent claims 34, 43, and 52 for at least this reason. Consequently, the rejections of claims 34, 43, and 52, and the claims that depend from them, should be reversed.

2. A combination of Kraemer and Yedidia as suggested by the Examiner is improper because it would be directly contrary to the teachings of Kraemer and the intended use of Kraemer's invention.

Even if Kraemer and Yedidia did disclose all of the elements of the present claims, their combination is not proper. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, "there must be some suggestion or motivation . . . to modify the reference." MPEP 2143. In the present case, there is no motivation because the Examiner's proposed modification of Kraemer's invention based on Yedidia is directly contrary to the teachings of Harada.

The Office Action opines that it would have been obvious to combine the addition policy of Yedidia with Kraemer "to provide a fast and easy mechanism to determine if special instructions or enhanced functionality should be added based upon the destination resource specified." Office Action, Page 10, Lines 4-6. However, as described above with respect to the rejections under 102, Kraemer teaches against this by seeking to provide a toolbar for any product or vendor webpage the user may visit. If a selective mechanism were provided in Kraemer, then Kraemer's system would not be able to provide the toolbar for any product webpage the user may visit, which would contrary to the teachings and functionality of Kraemer, for the reasons discussed above. Consequently, based on a reading of Kraemer, one of skill in the art would not look to incorporate such a selective mechanism into Kraemer. Yedidia provides nothing to refute this.

The Office Action also reasons that one would combine Yedidia and Kraemer to "provide for faster content display by obtaining the content locally from one server rather than having to be redirected to another server which adds to the latency and wait time." Office Action, Page 10, Lines 6-8. Yet, this motivation argues against combining Yedidia and Kraemer in a way that results in the subject matter of independent claims 34, 43, and 52. In those claims, the browser

request is directed to a server other than the destination server. Directing a browser request to a server other than the destination server may provide some advantages, but doing so will not reduce latency and wait time. Therefore, if one of skill in the art were looking to combine Yedidia and Kraemer to provide for faster content display by not redirecting requests, then that person would not combine them in a way that includes directing the request to a server other than the destination server as presently claimed.

Therefore, the combination of Kraemer and Yedidia is improper and, accordingly, fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for independent claims 34, 43, and 52 for at least this reason. Consequently, the rejections of claims 34, 43, and 52, and the claims that depend from them, should be reversed.

The brief fee has previously been filed and therefore a fee is not believed to be due at this time. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

10/12/06



Kevin E. Greene
Reg. No. 46,031

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

Appendix of Claims

1-6. (Cancelled).

7. (Previously Presented) A method of processing a browser request from a browser executing on a computer, the method comprising:

intercepting the browser request from the browser executing on the computer;
when the browser request specifies a selected destination network resource;
splitting a display of the browser into at least two sections;
displaying the selected destination network resource in a first of the two sections; and
displaying a toolbar in a second of the two sections.

8. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 7 further comprising determining whether the browser request specifies the selected network resource.

9. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 8 wherein determining whether the browser request specifies the selected destination network resource comprises:

determining a destination network resource specified by the browser request; and
comparing the destination network resource specified by the browser request to a list of selected destination network resources to determine if the destination network resource specified by the browser request matches at least one of the selected destination network resources in the list.

10. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 7 wherein, when the browser request specifies a selected destination network resource, the method further comprises directing the browser request to a server other than a destination server on which the selected destination network resource resides.

11. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 7 wherein the toolbar comprises shopping tools.

12-17. (Cancelled).

18. (Previously Presented) A system for processing a browser request from a browser executing on a computer, the system comprising:

 a filter that intercepts the browser request from the browser executing on the computer;
 and

 an instruction processor that, when the browser request specifies a selected destination network resource:

 splits a display of the browser into at least two sections;

 displays the selected destination network resource in a first of the two sections; and

 displays a toolbar in a second of the two sections.

19. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 18 further comprising a determiner to determine whether the browser request specifies the selected network resource.

20. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 19 wherein the determiner comprises:

 an inspector to determine a destination network resource specified by the browser request; and

 a comparer to compare the destination network resource specified by the browser request to a list of selected destination network resources to determine if the destination network resource specified by the browser request matches at least one of the selected destination network resources in the list.

21. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 18 further comprising a redirector that, when the browser request specifies a selected destination network resource, directs the browser request to a server other than a destination server on which the selected destination network resource resides.

22. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 18 wherein the toolbar comprises shopping tools.

23-28. (Cancelled).

29. (Previously Presented) A system for processing a browser request from a browser executing on a computer, the system comprising:

means for intercepting the browser request from the browser executing on the computer;

means for splitting a display of the browser into at least two sections when the browser request specifies a selected destination resource;

means for displaying the selected destination network resource in a first of the two sections when the browser request specifies a selected destination resource; and

means for displaying a toolbar in a second of the two sections when the browser request specifies a selected destination resource.

30. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 29 further comprising means for determining whether the browser request specifies the selected network resource.

31. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 30 wherein the means for determining whether the browser request specifies the selected network resource comprises:

means for determining a destination network resource specified by the browser request; and

means for comparing the destination network resource specified by the browser request to a list of selected destination network resources to determine if the destination network resource specified by the browser request matches at least one of the selected destination network resources in the list..

32. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 29 further comprising means for, when the browser request specifies a selected destination resource, directing the browser request to a server other than a destination server on which the selected destination resource resides.

33. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 29 wherein the toolbar comprises shopping tools.

34. (Previously Presented) A method of processing a browser request from a browser executing on a computer, wherein the browser request specifies a destination network resource residing on a destination server, the method comprising:

intercepting the browser request that specifies a destination network resource residing on a destination server;

determining whether the destination network resource specified by the browser request matches at least one selected destination network resource;

directing the browser request to a server other than the destination server when the destination network resource specified by the browser request matches at least one selected destination network resource; and

processing the browser request at the other server, wherein processing the browser request comprises:

retrieving the destination network resource specified by the browser request;

splitting a display of the browser at the computer into at least two sections;

displaying the destination network resource specified by the browser request in a first of the two sections; and

displaying a toolbar in a second of the two sections.

35. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 34 wherein determining whether the destination network resource specified by the browser request matches at least one selected destination network resource comprises:

determining the destination network resource specified by the browser request;

comparing the destination network resource specified by the browser request to a list of selected destination network resources to determine if the destination network resource specified by the browser request matches at least one of the selected destination network resources in the list.

36. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 34 wherein retrieving the destination network resource specified by the browser request comprises retrieving the destination network resource specified by the browser request from the destination server.

37. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 34 wherein retrieving the destination network resource specified by the browser request comprises retrieving the destination network resource specified by the browser request from a cache associated with the server other than the destination server.

38. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 34 wherein the toolbar comprises shopping tools.

39. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 38 wherein the destination network resource specified by the browser request corresponds to a merchant web site.

40. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 39 wherein the toolbar comprises at least two segments.

41. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 40 wherein a first of the two segments comprise one or more of: a tool for selecting a shopping category; a tool for issuing a new browser request for a different destination network resource; a tool for obtaining customer service information; a tool for finding an appropriate merchant based on a user's shopping needs; or a tool for obtaining protection in the event of unfair treatment by a merchant.

42. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 40 wherein a second of the two segments comprise one or more of: a tool for accelerating business transactions with the merchant web site corresponding to the destination network resource specified by the browser request; a tool for determining one or more merchant web sites that a user has previously visited; a tool for issuing a request for a destination network resource that corresponds to a most recently

visited merchant web site; or a tool for searching the merchant web site that corresponds to the destination network resource specified by the browser request.

43. (Previously Presented) A system for processing a browser request from a browser executing on a computer, wherein the browser request specifies a destination network resource residing on a destination server, the system comprising:

an interceptor to intercept the browser request that specifies a destination network resource residing on a destination server;

a determiner to determine whether the destination network resource specified by the browser request matches at least one selected destination network resource;

a redirector to direct the browser request to a server other than the destination server when the destination network resource specified by the browser request matches at least one selected destination network resource; and

a processor to process the browser request at the other server, wherein to process the browser request, the processor:

retrieves the destination network resource specified by the browser request;

splits a display of the browser at the computer into at least two sections;

displays the destination network resource specified by the browser request in a first of the two sections; and

displays a toolbar in a second of the two sections.

44. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 43, wherein the determiner comprises:

an inspector to determine the destination network resource specified by the browser request;

a comparer to compare the destination network resource specified by the browser request to a list of selected destination network resources to determine if the destination network resource specified by the browser request matches at least one of the selected destination network resources in the list.

45. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 43, wherein, to retrieve the destination network resource specified by the browser request, the processor retrieves the destination network resource specified by the browser request from the destination server.

46. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 43, wherein, to retrieve the destination network resource specified by the browser request, the processor retrieves the destination network resource specified by the browser request from a cache associated with the server other than the destination server.

47. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 43, wherein the toolbar comprises shopping tools.

48. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 47 wherein the destination network resource specified by the browser request corresponds to a merchant web site.

49. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 48 wherein the toolbar comprises at least two segments.

50. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 49 wherein a first of the two segments comprise one or more of: a tool for selecting a shopping category; a tool for issuing a new browser request for a different destination network resource; a tool for obtaining customer service information; a tool for finding an appropriate merchant based on a user's shopping needs; or a tool for obtaining protection in the event of unfair treatment by a merchant.

51. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 49 wherein a second of the two segments comprise one or more of: a tool for accelerating business transactions with the merchant web site corresponding to the destination network resource specified by the browser request; a tool for determining one or more merchant web sites that a user has previously visited; a tool for issuing a request for a destination network resource that corresponds to a most recently

visited merchant web site; or a tool for searching the merchant web site that corresponds to the destination network resource specified by the browser request.

52. (Previously Presented) A system for processing a browser request from a browser executing on a computer, wherein the browser request specifies a destination network resource residing on a destination server, the system comprising:

means for intercepting the browser request that specifies a destination network resource residing on a destination server;

means for determining whether the destination network resource specified by the browser request matches at least one selected destination network resource;

means for directing the browser request to a server other than the destination server when the destination network resource specified by the browser request matches at least one selected destination network resource; and

means for processing the browser request at the other server, wherein the means for processing the browser request comprises:

means for retrieving the destination network resource specified by the browser request;

means for splitting a display of the browser at the computer into at least two sections;

means for displaying the destination network resource specified by the browser request in a first of the two sections; and

means for displaying a toolbar in a second of the two sections.

53. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 52 wherein the means for determining whether the destination network resource specified by the browser request matches at least one selected destination network resource comprises:

means for determining the destination network resource specified by the browser request;

means for comparing the destination network resource specified by the browser request to a list of selected destination network resources to determine if the destination network resource specified by the browser request matches at least one of the selected destination network resources in the list.

54. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 52 wherein the means for retrieving the destination network resource specified by the browser request comprises means for retrieving the destination network resource specified by the browser request from the destination server.

55. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 52 wherein the means for retrieving the destination network resource specified by the browser request comprises means for retrieving the destination network resource specified by the browser request from a cache associated with the server other than the destination server.

56. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 52 wherein the toolbar comprises shopping tools.

57. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 56 wherein the destination network resource specified by the browser request corresponds to a merchant web site.

58. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 57 wherein the toolbar comprises at least two segments.

59. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 58 wherein a first of the two segments comprise one or more of: a tool for selecting a shopping category; a tool for issuing a new browser request for a different destination network resource; a tool for obtaining customer service information; a tool for finding an appropriate merchant based on a user's shopping needs; or a tool for obtaining protection in the event of unfair treatment by a merchant.

60. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 58 wherein a second of the two segments comprise one or more of: a tool for accelerating business transactions with the merchant web site corresponding to the destination network resource specified by the browser request; a tool for determining one or more merchant web sites that a user has previously visited; a tool for issuing a request for a destination network resource that corresponds to a most recently

visited merchant web site; or a tool for searching the merchant web site that corresponds to the destination network resource specified by the browser request.

61. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 11 wherein the selected destination network resource corresponds to a merchant web site.

62. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 61 wherein the toolbar comprises at least two segments.

63. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 62 wherein a first of the two segments comprise one or more of: a tool for selecting a shopping category; a tool for issuing a new browser request for a different destination network resource; a tool for obtaining customer service information; a tool for finding an appropriate merchant based on a user's shopping needs; or a tool for obtaining protection in the event of unfair treatment by a merchant.

64. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 62 wherein a second of the two segments comprise one or more of: a tool for accelerating business transactions with the merchant web site corresponding to the selected destination network resource; a tool for determining one or more merchant web sites that a user has previously visited; a tool for issuing a request for a destination network resource that corresponds to a most recently visited merchant web site; or a tool for searching the merchant web site that corresponds to the selected destination network resource.

65. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 22 wherein the selected destination network resource corresponds to a merchant web site.

66. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 65 wherein the toolbar comprises at least two segments.

67. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 66 wherein a first of the two segments comprise one or more of: a tool for selecting a shopping category; a tool for issuing a new browser request for a different destination network resource; a tool for obtaining customer service information; a tool for finding an appropriate merchant based on a user's shopping needs; or a tool for obtaining protection in the event of unfair treatment by a merchant.

68. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 66 wherein a second of the two segments comprise one or more of: a tool for accelerating business transactions with the merchant web site corresponding to the selected destination network resource; a tool for determining one or more merchant web sites that a user has previously visited; a tool for issuing a request for a destination network resource that corresponds to a most recently visited merchant web site; or a tool for searching the merchant web site that corresponds to the selected destination network resource.

69. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 33 wherein the selected destination network resource corresponds to a merchant web site.

70. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 69 wherein the toolbar comprises at least two segments.

71. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 70 wherein a first of the two segments comprise one or more of: a tool for selecting a shopping category; a tool for issuing a new browser request for a different destination network resource; a tool for obtaining customer service information; a tool for finding an appropriate merchant based on a user's shopping needs; or a tool for obtaining protection in the event of unfair treatment by a merchant.

72. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 70 wherein a second of the two segments comprise one or more of: a tool for accelerating business transactions with the merchant web site corresponding to the selected destination network resource; a tool for determining one or more merchant web sites that a user has previously visited; a tool for issuing

Applicant : David Arsenault
Serial No. : 09/693,840
Filed : October 23, 2000
Page : 20 of 22

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-063001

a request for a destination network resource that corresponds to a most recently visited merchant web site; or a tool for searching the merchant web site that corresponds to the selected destination network resource.

Applicant : David Arsenault
Serial No. : 09/693,840
Filed : October 23, 2000
Page : 21 of 22

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-063001

Evidence Appendix

None.

Applicant : David Arsenault
Serial No. : 09/693,840
Filed : October 23, 2000
Page : 22 of 22

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-063001

Related Proceedings Appendix

None.